

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

CONFIRMATION

From the:
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

Alban Tay Mahtani & De Silva
39 Robinson Road #07-01
Robinson Point
Singapore 068911

RECEIVED
A.T.M.D.

'05 MAR 21 -8 :41

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

03 MAR 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference
20400446KC

REPLY DUE within **TWO MONTHS**
from the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/SG2004/000068

International filing date (day/month/year)

23 March 2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

2 April 2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Int. Cl. ⁷ G01C 21/30

Applicant

CHUA, Beng San et al

1. ☒ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:

☒ is ☐ is not
considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This 2 (second, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
☐ Box No. II Priority
☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the **Reply Due** date indicated above. However, the Australian Patent Office will not establish the Report before the earlier of (i) a response being filed, or (ii) one month before the **Final Date** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established. The Report will take into account any response (including amendments) filed before the Report is established. **If no response is filed by 1 month before the Final Date**, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

Applicants wishing to have the benefit of a further opinion (if needed) before the report is established should ensure that a response is filed at least **3 months before the Final Date** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established.

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

4. The **FINAL DATE** by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 2 August 2005

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU
AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaustalia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

J.W. THOMSON

Telephone No. (02) 6283 2214

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

10/547683

PCT/SG2004/000068

Box No. I **Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language
which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:
 - ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1 (b))
 - ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
 - ☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)
2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed.")*:
 - ☐ the international application as originally filed/furnished
 - ☒ the description: pages 1-9, as originally filed/furnished
pages , received by this Authority on with the letter of
pages , received by this Authority on with the letter of
 - ☒ the claims: pages 10-11, as originally filed/furnished
pages , as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19,
pages 12, received by this Authority on 2 November 2004 with the letter of 1 November 2004
pages , received by this Authority on with the letter of
 - ☒ the drawings: pages 1/5 - 5/5, as originally filed/furnished
pages , received by this Authority on with the letter of
pages , received by this Authority on with the letter of
 - ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.
3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
 - ☐ the description, pages
 - ☐ the claims, Nos. 21
 - ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs
 - ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*):
 - ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*):
4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).
 - ☐ the description, pages
 - ☐ the claims, Nos.
 - ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs
 - ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*):
 - ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*):

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SG2004/000068

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/IPEA/405) to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:
- ☐ restricted the claims
 - ☐ paid additional fees
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest
 - ☐ neither restricted nor paid additional fees
2. ☒ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with for the following reasons and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees:

Claim 1: Relates to a display map having a zooming method in which the scale of the map displayed is determined by the number of entities present in the map. The determination of the number of entities present and the comparison to a pre determined threshold is the first special technical feature.

Claim 19: Relates to a display map having two parts in which the first part a map is displayed at a first scale and in the second part the map is displayed at a second scale. Displaying the same map side by side at two different scales is the second technical feature.

These groups of claims are not linked as to form a single general inventive concept, that is, they do not share any special technical features. Therefore these claims do not relate to one invention only

3. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:

- ☒ all parts
- ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SG2004/000068

Box No. V **Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 1-22	YES
	Claims	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 1-22	YES
	Claims	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-22	YES
	Claims	NO

3. Citations and explanations:

D1: Derwent Abstract Accession No. 2002-613805/66, Class P85;T01, JP 2002216143-A (JO) 2 August 2003

The invention defined by claims 1-18 appears to be both novel and inventive in light of the citations listed in the ISR with no disclosure of a map having a zooming method in which the scale of the map displayed is determined by the number of entities present in the map.

Furthermore, the invention defined by claims 19-22 appears to be novel and inventive in light of citation D1 which fails to disclose a map having two parts in which the first part a map is displayed at a first scale and in the second part the map is displayed at a second scale